

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 1. KAVON LONDON GRANT;  
15 2. DEANDRE DONTRELL WILSON;  
16 3. KEITH JONES;  
17 4. DAVID BRIAN LINDSEY;  
18 5. ASA HOUSTON;  
6. DURK BANKS,

Defendants.

Case No. CR 24-621-MWF

**BRADY DISCLOSURE ORDER**

19 Under federal law, including Rule 5(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal  
20 Procedure, *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and all applicable decisions from  
21 the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit interpreting *Brady*, the government has a  
22 continuing obligation to produce all information or evidence known to the  
23 government relating to guilt or punishment that might reasonably be considered  
24 favorable to the defendant's case, even if the evidence is not admissible so long as it  
25 is reasonably likely to lead to admissible evidence. *See United States v. Price*, 566  
26 F.3d 900, 913 n.14 (9th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, the Court orders the government to  
27 produce to the Defendants in a timely manner all such information or evidence.

28 ///


1 Information or evidence may be favorable to a defendant's case if it either may  
2 help bolster the defendant's case or impeach a prosecutor's witness or other  
3 government evidence. If doubt exists, it should be resolved in favor of the  
4 Defendant(s) with full disclosure being made.

5 If the government believes that a required disclosure would compromise  
6 witness safety, victim rights, national security, a sensitive law-enforcement technique,  
7 or any other substantial government interest, the government may apply to the Court  
8 for a modification of the requirements of this Disclosure Order, which may include *in*  
9 *camera* review and/or withholding or subjecting to a protective order all or part of the  
10 information.

11 This Disclosure Order is entered under Rule 5(f) and does not relieve any party  
12 in this matter of any other discovery obligation. The consequences for violating either  
13 this Disclosure Order or the government's obligations under *Brady* include, but are  
14 not limited to, the following: contempt, sanction, referral to disciplinary authority,  
15 adverse jury instruction, exclusion of evidence, and dismissal of charges. Nothing in  
16 this Disclosure Order enlarges or diminishes the government's obligation to disclose  
17 information and evidence to a defendant under *Brady*, as interpreted and applied under  
18 Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit precedent. As the Supreme Court noted, "the  
19 government violates the Constitution's Due Process Clause 'if it withholds evidence  
20 that is favorable to the defense and material to the defendant's guilt or punishment.'" *Turner v. United States*, 137 S. Ct. 1885, 1888 (2017), quoting *Smith v. Cain*, 565  
21 U.S. 73, 75 (2012).

22  
23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24  
25 Dated: November 18, 2024

26  
27  
28  
  
MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD  
United States District Judge